



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

PUBLICATIONS
OF THE
Modern Language Association of America
1917

VOL. XXXII, 2

NEW SERIES, VOL. XXV, 2

VI.—THE *SPECULUM VITAE*: ADDENDUM

The present paper is intended to form a postscript to the last section of my study of the authorship of the *Prick of Conscience*, published in 1910.¹ In the earlier article the traditional attribution of the poem to Richard Rolle, the hermit of Hampole, was attacked, and in conclusion a clue was followed which seemed to lead towards the *Speculum Vitae*, a similar Middle-English poem still unedited. A connection between the two poems had apparently been built up by J. Ullmann,² in an elaborate analysis of similar stylistic peculiarities found in both, and he had used the evidence, thus apparently deduced, to urge the ascription (found in one copy of the *Speculum*) to Rolle, then always credited with the authorship of the *Prick of Conscience*. Ullmann's conclusion as to the common authorship of the two poems was used in the discussion as to the authorship of the latter by turning them

¹ *Studies in English and Comparative Literature, Radcliffe College Monographs*, No. 15, Boston and New York, pp. 115-170.

² *Englische Studien*, VII, pp. 415 ff. The poem is described and the first three hundred lines are quoted.

about: since two other copies of the *Speculum* gave the work to William of Nassington,³ it was suggested, when Rolle's authorship of the *Prick of Conscience* seemed impossible, that the true author might be found in Nassington, who was possibly the author of the very similar *Speculum*. However, since the latter work was not in print, and had not at the time of writing been accessible to me in manuscript, the discussion as to the connection between the two works could only be incomplete and tentative.

Since 1910, I have examined thirty-one manuscripts of the *Speculum*,⁴ and other material connected with it

* The attribution runs as follows:

“ . . . pray specially
 For Freere Johan saule of Waldby,
 That fast studyd day and nyght,
 And made this tale in Latyne right. . . .
 Prayes also wt deucion
 For William saule of Nassyngtone,
 That gaf hym als fulle besyly
 Night and day to grete study
 And made this tale in Inglys tonge.”

This ending is quoted from Reg. MS. 17 C. VIII in Warton-Hazlitt, *History of English Poetry*, London, 1871, III, p. 116, n. 2. Hatton MS. 19 gives substantially the same. Both manuscripts belong to the early fifteenth century. It may be noted that nine of the thirty-one manuscripts of the poem which I have examined are imperfect at the end, where an attribution would occur.

* I wish to thank here the owners of the manuscripts described for the courtesy which I have everywhere received. I do not list the copies of the *Speculum* because a complete list will appear in the second part of the *Register of Middle-English Poetry* of Professor Carleton Brown (Oxford University Press, Pt. I, 1917). I wish to thank also the librarians of Syracuse, Cornell, and Columbia Universities, who have courteously allowed me access to their shelves at various times. The notes made from manuscripts have unfortunately not been read with the originals since they were taken in 1910 when I held the fellowship of the Association of Collegiate Alumnae. This paper was “read by title” at the meeting of the Association in 1914.

has been studied. The present paper therefore will set forth the results of this research, and terminate the discussions begun in the earlier one, in so far as they concern the *Speculum Vitae*, and have in any way been altered by the more complete evidence available in that connection, since the first paper was written. The material here described does not lead to complete conclusions as to the origin of the *Speculum Vitae*, but it is hoped that it will be useful as far as it goes. The larger investigation, that of the manuscripts of all the works of Richard Rolle, and of those of the *Prick of Conscience*,—to which it has been subordinate,—will be presented in later papers, and will complete the main discussion of the paper in 1910, as the present paper is intended to complete that of the last section.

A surprising result of the recent investigation of material connected with the *Speculum* has been to discredit completely the specific evidence on which Ullmann built up his conclusions. It has been discovered that the classifications of stylistic peculiarities which he applied to the two poems were for the most part derived—sometimes *verbatim*—from three studies of the style of Old-French writers. These are: *Benoit de Sainte-More. Eine sprachliche untersuchung über identität der verfasser des "Roman de Troie" und der "Chronique des Ducs de Normandie,"* by F. Settegast,—a study made in 1876 (several years before Ullmann's), also at Breslau; *Der Stil Crestien's von Troies*, by R. Grosse, *Französische Studien*, i, pp. 127 ff.; and *Guillaume, le clerc de Normandie, insbesondere seine Magdalenenlegende*, by A. Schmidt, *Boehmer's Romanische Studien*, iv, pp. 493 ff. Ullmann sometimes refers to stylistic peculiarities in *romanzen-poesie* similar to those with which he is concerned here, but he cites no authorities, though his use of the authors

just listed amounts sometimes to plagiarism. Since the characteristics which he found that the two poems possessed in common are thus discovered not to be peculiar to them, no value of course remains in the use by Ullmann of these similarities as a criterion of common authorship. The relation of Ullmann's work to his sources will be illustrated in another paper, where it will form the basis for another discussion. It must be said here, however, that nothing has appeared to make the hypothesis of a common authorship for the *Speculum Vitae* and the *Prick of Conscience* untenable, though there is now no special evidence on which this hypothesis may be grounded.

It must be said at once that the examination of the manuscripts of the *Speculum* has increased the uncertainty as to its authorship. The name of William of Nassington has not been found attached to more than the two copies already known, and no name of another author has been substituted. Nothing has been added to our information as to this person, and he may or may not be the author of the *Speculum*. It is also somewhat disconcerting to find that the Latin prose *Commentary on the Pater Noster* of John de Waldeby, Provincial of the Augustinian Friars in England at the close of the fourteenth century, of which many copies still exist, is not the source of the English poem. This treatise is a long work of which the prologue begins with the text: *Septies in die laudem dixi tibi*. . . . (a beginning also quoted from a *Commentary on the Pater Noster* ascribed by Tanner to "Thos. Colby.")⁵ In Reg. MS. 7 E II and other copies of Waldeby's *Pater Noster*, his *Commentaries on the Angelical Salutation and the Creed* immediately follow, and the authorship of the latter is put beyond all doubt by the appearance of a prefatory letter

⁵ See A. G. Little, *Initia operum latinorum*, Manchester, 1904.

addressed to Thomas, Abbot of St. Alban's, who, the letter states, when at Tynemouth at the translation of the relics of St. Oswin, had spoken of Waldeby's sermons delivered at York. Some fame for this letter is apparent from its inclusion in a "model letter-writer" in Trinity College Cambridge MS. 1285, f. 72b.

It may of course be possible that a second commentary by Waldeby was the source of the *Speculum*. Considerable material exists for the study of his writings, and it is evidently in confusion. He has apparently been confused with his brother, the Archbishop of York, Robert (*v. D. N. B.*), perhaps with a "Jean de Galles" who lived in London in 1368,⁶ and also perhaps with the famous Minorite of the thirteenth century (as famous in France as in England), Joannes Wallensis. For example, Lambeth MS. 352 contains a copy of Waldeby's *Pater Noster* already referred to, under the title "Itinerarium Salutis."⁷ An "Itinerarium" is one of the three parts of the "Ordinarium" of the Minorite (*v. D. N. B.*), and Haenel notes as, apparently, a separate work, "Ioan. Wallensis itinerarium."⁸

A lengthy list of the writings of the Augustinian can be made out from the catalogue of books in the Austin Friars' library at York, compiled in his lifetime,⁹ perhaps

⁶ See *Histoire littéraire de la France*, xxv, pp. 179 f. Perhaps this is the Johannes Wellis, Monk of Ramsey, who was one of the bitterest opponents of Wycliffe. See *Fasciculi Zizaniorum*, Rolls Series, London, 1858, pp. 113 *et passim*, and *Monumenta Franciscana*, Rolls Series, London, 1858, p. 598. In the *Fasciculi* John de Waldeby is evidently confused with his brother, when he is called Archbishop of Dublin (p. 356).

⁷ The work is found with the same title in Corpus Christi College Cambridge MS. 317, and Laud Misc. MS. 296.

⁸ *Catalogi Librum Manuscriptorum*, Leipzig, 1830, p. 123.

⁹ *The Catalogue of the Library of the Augustinian Friars, York*, ed. by M. R. James, in *Fasciculus J. W. Clark Dictatus*, Cambridge,

during his residence there.¹⁰ Some of these works are unknown except for their mention here, but more could certainly be found than are listed in the *D. N. B.*¹¹ It may be noted that, in a ms. of Waldeby's *Pater Noster* quoted from by M. Petit-Dutaillis, he is referred to as "Professor of Holy Writ at Oxford,"¹² and he is called "Professor of Holy Writ" in Lambeth ms. 352. Probably we cannot be absolutely sure whether or no Waldeby had a connection with the *Speculum* till the manuscripts of all his works are worked over, and it is possible that "Joannes Wallensis" may be found to be the author of the source. He died c. 1303, and his dates would therefore combine better with Nassington's—who died in 1359 (if the identification made in my former paper is correct)—than Waldeby's, who died apparently in 1393.

An English prose *Mirror* is found in three copies, and, as quotations made at the end of this paper will show, it is evident from a superficial comparison with the *Speculum* that they both render the same work. The *Mirror* throws no light on the origin of the poem, and the relation of the two is uncertain. A line-by-line comparison has not been

1909. Several entries occur here of a *Comment on the Pater Noster* ascribed to Waldeby, some of which are followed by the same two pieces as in the Reg. ms.; but we have no means of knowing whether they all refer to the same work.

¹⁰ He is referred to as "Eboracensis" in Laud Misc. MS. 77.

¹¹ Laud Misc. MS. 77 of the early fifteenth century may specially be pointed out as interesting for the study of Waldeby. Latin *Sermones Dominicales* are here followed by some English alliterative verses, and a set of stories for preachers. The whole is entitled *Novum opus Dominicale*. The date of composition is given as 1365. (I quote from the catalogue.) The title *Novum opus* is applied in the York catalogue to two works by Waldeby—a *Doctrinale*, and a work *De Sanctis* (p. 77). The catalogue was compiled in 1372.

¹² *Études d'histoire du moyen-âge, Dédices à Gabriel Monod*, Paris, 1896, pp. 384 ff. He quotes from Caius Coll. MS. 334.

made, but, failing that, a few observations can be hazarded on the subject.

It is possible that the *Mirror* is derived from the *Speculum*, for, at the beginning of the fourteenth century, it was the fashion in France, at any rate, to put out versions of old poems in a "desrimé" form,¹³ and there are even signs, at that time, of a prejudice against verse as a vehicle not sufficiently serious for truthful compositions.¹⁴ Against this hypothesis must be put the fact that there seem to be few traces of this fashion in England. Moreover, the beginnings of the two works differ entirely, and the easiest explanation for their divergence would be on the ground of their being separate translations of the same original.

¹³ Dès la fin du XIII^e siècle, on avait commencé, selon l'expression du temps, à "desrimer" les anciens poèmes français (*Histoire Littéraire*, XXIII, p. 326).

¹⁴ Warton quotes prologues of prose works which declare that "*Estoire rimée semble mensunge*," "*Nuz contes rymes n'en est vrais*," (II, p. 137), and Froissart is quoted in the same strain (*Le Prince Noir*, ed. F. Michel, London, 1863, p. x, n.). Professor G. L. Hamilton has kindly pointed out similar statements in the following works: a prose version of the *Roman de Troie* (A. Joly, *Benoît de Sainte-More et Le Roman de Troie*, Paris, 1870, I, pp. 422, 423, n.); a version of the *Pseudo-Turpin* (*Romania*, XVI, p. 61); a history of Philip Augustus (*op. cit.*, VI, p. 495); a *Bestiaire* (*Notices et Extraits*, XXXIII, Pt. I, p. 22). He also points out the apology which the author of the Anglo-Norman *Romanz de tute chevalerie* (probably "Master Eustace") feels it necessary to make for his use of verse (P. Meyer, *Alexandre le Grand dans la littérature française du moyen âge*, Paris, 1886, I, p. 221, v. 43). The reasons urged against the use of verse are generally its use by minstrels, and its addition of extra words. Master Eustace is an Englishman, but, aside from his work, the nearest analogy to be found in England is the following, from the Dialogue prefixed by Trevisa to his version of the *Polychronicon*. The Lord answers to the clerk, when asked whether he prefers a translation in rhyme or prose, "In prose, for commonly prose is more clear than rhyme, more easy and more plain to know and understand" (*Fifteenth Century Prose and Verse*, ed. A. W. Pollard, *An English Garner*, vol. XII, p. 207).

As will be seen later in the illustrative quotations, the introduction of the *Speculum* contains two elements not found in the *Mirror*,—namely, the declaration of the utility of its subject-matter, as compared to that of romances,—a list of which is enumerated,¹⁵—and the explanation of the choice of the vernacular as the medium for the work.¹⁶

¹⁵ Innumerable examples of the same sort are to be found in Old French and Anglo-Norman works,—“Combien de fois n’a-t-on pas opposé les aventures des saints à celles des preux et des chevaliers!” (Petit de Julleville, *Histoire de la langue et de la littérature française*, Paris, 1896, I, p. 20). See for examples, *Romania*, XII, p. 147, XVI, p. 66, Angier, *Dialogues de St. Grégoire*, ed. T. Cloran, Strasburg, 1901, p. 14. English examples of the same kind are cited in Warton, II, pp. 122, 125. Similar comparisons are made in sermons,—see quotations from Robert de Sorbon and Gerald de Liège made by M. Ch. V. Langlois in his article, “L’éloquence sacrée au Moyen-Age” (*Revue des Deux Mondes*, Jan. 1893, p. 190; *multi tamen compatiuntur Rolando et non Christo*); and a Lollard tract in Camb. Univ. MS. li. vi. 26, f. 131,—“But summam seiþ, I prieie þee leue þees spechis And telle me a mery tale of giy of warwyk, Beufiz of hamtoun, eiper of Sire (??), Robyn hod, eiper of summe wel farynge man of here condiciouns and maners.” The fact that Middle English literature simply perpetuates in such examples a fashion begun in Anglo-Norman appears from comparison of the thirteenth-century *Passion of Our Lord* (*EETS*, No. 49, p. 37) with the *Josaphat* of the almost contemporary Anglo-Norman Chardry (*Altfranzösische Bibliothek*, I, p. 74); or the Middle English *Mirrur* and the Anglo-Norman *Miroir* (see my article in *Modern Philology*, XIII, p. 741). These comparisons—like the prejudice against prose already mentioned—were doubtless part of the competition of monastic writers with writers of romantic fiction (as is noted by Miss Laura Hibbard, *Romanic Review*, IV, p. 183). A reason for their popularity can be found in the fondness that has been noted in the Middle Ages for all kinds of catalogues. From this point of view the present examples come very near to the second part of *Sir Thopas*, and our impression is confirmed that they represent an almost stereotyped form (see *Chaucers Sir Thopas*, by J. Bennewitz, Halle, 1879, p. 15).

¹⁶ A long tradition for such explanations existed in Old French, Anglo-Norman, and Middle English, as will be shown in another paper. Examples in which a Middle English work derived such an

Both these *motifs* were what might be called fashionable elements in the introductions to popular works during several centuries; they had been very frequent in French and Anglo-Norman literature for laymen for generations before they passed into Middle English. The introduction of the *Mirror*, on the other hand, is purely theological,—opening as it does with the exposition of a text,—and it is such as would be suitable to a *Summa* on the Pater Noster,—which is the sort of work that we can imagine the source of the *Speculum* to be. It may be useful as a clue for searching out the direct source for that work. A motive can be seen for substituting in a composition seeking to be popular with laymen, the sprightly introduction, after a popular manner, which is found in the poem, whereas no motive can be seen for supplanting the introduction found in the *Speculum* by that found in the *Mirror*.

As a matter of fact, several cases are to be noted in which the reference to romances was interpolated into prologues in which it was not originally present. The comparison with a list of romances in the *Cursor Mundi* is inserted into one group of the manuscripts of the *Prick of Conscience*;¹⁷ one copy of the *Bible* of Geffroi de Paris contains a prologue contrasting the story of Roland with the Passion (this is altogether the commonest antithesis made),¹⁸ and a lengthy example of the same sort is borrowed from the *Calendrier* of the Anglo-Norman Raüf de Linham in an Anglo-Norman poem on the Nine Daughters of the Devil.

element from the Anglo-Norman are the *Mirrur*, already referred to, and the *Lamentation of Mary* (see *Modern Philology*, *loc. cit.*, and xiv, pp. 255-6).

¹⁷ See my article on "the Manuscript Evidence for the Authorship of the *Prick of Conscience*," now under preparation.

¹⁸ *Les Traductions de la Bible en vers français au moyen âge*, par J. Bonnard, Paris, 1884, p. 52.

M. Meyer says of the interpolation . . . “que je ne saurais expliquer d’une manière satisfaisante. . . . L’emprunt est assurément singulier.”¹⁹ The extreme popularity of such introductions seems sufficient reason for such an insertion; the *lieux communs* found in edifying literature appear to be as much the subject of fashions as the *motifs* of romances. It would be natural therefore to explain the prologue of the *Speculum* as an attempt to follow the current fashions, and not necessarily an exact reproduction of its original. However, the relation of the *Speculum* and *Mirror* cannot, of course, be settled in the present state of our knowledge.

The *Speculum* occurs in three copies²⁰ with a title such as, *Liber de Pater Noster*, and in fact it is, as has already been noted, a *Summa* on the Pater Noster which we may expect to be the source. Though the direct source has not been found, some clues can be given as to its elements. The exact outline and in some passages the exact material is given in an anonymous Latin tract on the Pater Noster existing in at least five copies. This work has been noted, but its connection with the *Speculum* has never before been recognized.²¹ It apparently enjoyed considerable authority, since, as is here pointed out for the first time, the first part was used in the popular compendium entitled the *Speculum Spiritualium*.²² It has

¹⁹ *Romania*, xxix, p. 54.

²⁰ Ll. i. 8, McClean 130 (at the Fitzwilliam Museum, formerly “ms. A” of Samuel W. Singer, as Brit. Mus. Addit. ms. 22, 558 is “ms. B”), and Bodl. ms. Eng. Poet. d. 5 (formerly the Corser ms.).

²¹ See *infra*, p. 156.

²² Cap. xxvii, Fol. lxxvii. This work, of which partial copies at least go back to the late fifteenth century (v. ms. Dd. iv, 54), was printed by W. Hopyl in 1510 in Paris at the expense of William Bretton, a London citizen. The work is confessedly designed primarily for the use of contemplatives, and it quotes largely from the English mystics. The author withholds his name, but it is given in the *Catalogue of the Library of Syon Monastery* (ed. Mary Bateson,

not been compared line by line with the *Speculum*, but it is clear from sporadic comparisons throughout the text that it gives a far briefer and more purely theological treatment of its subject than the *Speculum Vitae*; the picturesque passages giving glimpses of the familiar life of the time are all lacking, but the relation of the poem to the tract is nevertheless unmistakable.

In the material in general the Middle-English *Speculum* and *Mirror* stand very near to the famous *Somme* of Frère Lorens, the source of the *Ayenbite of Inwit*. The *Speculum* has been said to be founded on the *Somme*, and again, no complete comparison has been made; but enough has been done²³ to show that the true relation is uncertain and complicated. Parts are identical, as the quotations at the end of this paper will prove, but again the *Somme* will give only the sketch of what is found in the *Speculum*. Much of the picturesque realism of the poem is derived from the *Somme*,²⁴ but, on the other hand, the best of such

Cambridge, 1898, p. 202) as "Adam, monachus Carthusiensis." I wish to thank the librarian of Union Theological Seminary for the use of his copy—of which I learned through a reference by Professor T. F. Crane in the *Romanic Review*, vi, p. 220.

²³ The relation of the two works is pointed out in the description of Addit. ms. 22, 283, in the catalogue of the manuscripts of the British Museum.—A Middle English prose version by a "knyght of, Kyng henrye, conqueroure of Normandye," writing in 1451, is found in the Bodl. ms. E. Mus. 23, with the curious title *Aventure and grace*, which is thus explained: "þer as I was not perfecte of the langage of frensch by symple vndirstondyng of the langage, methowght it was vertues I adventured to drawe it in to englisch, and in many places ther I coude not englisch it, grace of the holy goste wafe me englisch acordyng to the sentens, wich come of grace. So þe ferste bygonn with aventure, and so folowid grace" (f. 261). Other English versions are noted in the preface to the *Ayenbite of Inwit* (*EETS*, No. 23).

²⁴ For example, the account of the "miracles of the Devil" who sends a man into a tavern with his wits, and out without them (in the account of Gluttony, ms. II. i. 26, f. 88b., *Romania*, xxiv, p. 68).

material is new. In the prologue, as the quotations will show, the *Speculum* uses the *Somme* less than the tract on the Pater Noster, but the two latter for a few sentences coincide. What may be the general relation between these two sources is uncertain. There were a multitude of *Summae* of their type circulating during the Middle Ages, as has especially been shown by the studies made in the effort to settle the source of Chaucer's *Parsons Tale*; ²⁵ and the research that they have so far received has done no more than disclose the problem of their history. The exact particulars given in many manuscripts of the *Somme*, as to the date and circumstances ²⁶ of its composition, are very definite, and one would expect plain sailing for the student of this most famous of all mediæval *Summae* for laymen; nevertheless, the origin and structure of the work are actually involved in such obscurity that the best that can be done at present is to state the problem, since, owing to the relation which exists between the *Speculum* and the *Somme*, it has some relation to our present enquiry as to the origin of the former. ²⁷

²⁵ See *Radcliffe College Monographs*, No. 12, *The Sources of the Parson's Tale*, by Kate O. Petersen, Boston, 1901, especially p. 80, n. 1: R. E. Fowler, *Une Source française des poèmes de Gower*, Macon, 1905.

²⁶ The book is said to have been compiled in 1279, by Frère Lorens, of the Order of Preachers, Confessor of the King, Philip, at whose request the work was undertaken. Professor G. L. Hamilton has pointed out to me the interesting note in the *Revue des langues romanes*, LVI, pp. 20 f., which quotes the epitaph of Lorens. He is thereby proved to have been tutor of the King's children as well as confessor to the King, formerly Prior of the convent at Paris, and, apparently, a native of Orleans. A reference to his *Somme* seems to lie in the mention of his ethical teaching. His death is put between 1296 and 1300.

²⁷ See *Bulletin de la Société des anciens textes français*, 1881, pp. 48-9; 1892, pp. 68 ff.; *Romania*, XIV, pp. 532 ff., XXII, pp. 449 ff., XXVII, pp. 109 ff. C. Boser made a valuable study of the Provençal

M. Paul Meyer, to whom we owe our principal information on the subject of the *Somme*, as on so many other important questions of mediæval literary history, has divided the work into six parts,²⁸ and since most of these parts occur separately, he concludes that Frère Lorens's share in the work was no more than the consolidation of separate tracts, already old, and probably the composition of the last member.²⁹ A very puzzling element enters the situation from the appearance of a work very similar to the *Somme*, but not identical with it, known as the *Miroir du Monde*.³⁰ This work exists in an earlier and a later form, and the latter, which is especially similar to the *Somme*, even carries the same colophon as to the composition by Frère Lorens, at the request of the King in 1279.

texts in *Romania*, xxiv, pp. 56 ff., and planned an investigation of the *Somme* and all derivatives, but this enterprise was cut short by death (*op. cit.*, xxv, p. 338).

²⁸ *Bulletin*, 1892, *Romania*, xxiii.

²⁹ *Romania*, xxiii, p. 454. He refers (p. 450) to the part on the *Pater Noster*—"Qui par le style se distingue assez bien de ce qui précède, et de ce qui suit." It does not seem that M. Meyer's arguments for the composite origin of the *Somme* are conclusive, since he nowhere points out a copy of a part which antedates the time of Lorens. There is no reason why the latter might not have collected his own work, originally published separately. The style of the *Somme* is in general so unusually vivacious for mediæval theology that a composite authorship is a little hard to accept.

³⁰ *Bulletin*, 1892, *Romania*, xxiii. This work is in print, edited by Felix Chavannes, *La Mireour du Monde*, Lausanne, 1845, *Mémoires et documents publiés par la Société d'histoire de la Suisse romande*. The *Somme* of course is not in print, except in the Middle English translation, the *Ayenbite of Inwyit*, but large excerpts from the original are published by R. W. Evers, *Beiträge zur erklärang und textkritik von Dan Michel's Ayenbite of inwyt*, Erlangen, 1888. Other studies of the relation between the *Somme* and *Ayenbite* are to be found in *Englische Studien*, I, pp. 379 ff., II, pp. 98 ff. Harvard University possesses a manuscript of the *Somme*, which was given by Dr. Furnivall during his last illness, as a memorial to Professor Child.

In the complex problem of the origin of the *Somme* and its connections,³¹ one or two details should be pointed out as of interest for the problem of the origin of the *Speculum Vitae*. A writer who has studied the various treatises just mentioned in an investigation of the sources of Gower's *Mirour de L'Omme*, is of the opinion from the evidence yielded by her research, that a *Summa* from which both *Somme* and *Mirour* were derived, existed in a more extended form than either derivative,³² in which, it must be noted, the references to the familiar life of the time would be especially abundant. It is a pity that she was not able to bring into her investigation the *Speculum Vitae*, which shows a distinct relation to the French treatises, but more realistic details than they. The question of a lost prototype of the *Somme* has also been discussed in connection with a peculiar Provençal text,—in which, it should be noted, the construction follows that of the *Speculum* more closely than does the *Somme*, since it also strengthens, though not by the same means, the connections with the Pater Noster which bind the whole treatise together.³³ Again, the resemblance of title between the

³¹ M. Ch. V. Langlois writes in his *Vie en France au moyen âge d'après quelques moralistes du temps*, Paris, 1908, p. v.: "C'est à peine si les premiers travaux d'approche pour l'étude des sources de la célèbre compilation intitulée la *Somme le roi* . . . ont été exécutés."

³² Fowler, *op. cit.*, pp. 32 ff. It may be remarked that Joannes Walensis, already mentioned, who was one of the most conspicuous figures in the theological world in both England and France during the thirteenth century, would be a most likely person to be the author of such a work. He is already known to be the author of several *Summae*, and A. G. Little, in his *Grey Friars at Oxford* (Oxford, 1892, p. 149), notes that an exposition on the Pater Noster is sometimes assigned to the Minorite.

³³ *Romania*, xxiv, pp. 56 ff. This text begins with the Seven Deadly Sins. It introduces the *De quinque septenis* of Hugo of St. Victor to assist in forming the framework (p. 83).

two works makes it probable that the *Speculum* has used the *Miroir* rather than the *Somme*, and it is to be noted that some manuscripts of the *Miroir* contain a prologue which is not printed by Chavannes.³⁴ This may have been used in the *Speculum*. It seems that the *Miroir*, as printed, also omits the latter part of the work,³⁵ and, altogether, the relation of the *Speculum* and *Miroir* cannot be determined from the printed text of the latter.³⁶ It should be noted that all the French works here discussed put the exposition of the Pater Noster at the middle or end of the work, and they usually begin with the Ten Commandments.³⁷ The *Speculum*, on the other hand, expounds the Pater Noster at the beginning, and uses it as the frame to which the other subjects are linked, thus giving the whole a continuity not found in the French works,—for the lack of which they have been several times criticised.³⁸ It would appear that the *Speculum* and *Mirror* derive their superior arrangement from the tract on the Pater Noster, already mentioned, though in the case both of this piece and of the French treatises it may be that the relation is collateral, and it is even possible that the English works represent the ultimate source, if such existed, more fully than any other derivative.

In conclusion a word must be said as to the following note, found in three copies of the poem:

³⁴ See *Bulletin*, 1892, p. 70, n. 2.

³⁵ Fowler, p. 21.

³⁶ The general confusion can be illustrated by the case of the *exemplum* regarding "Marion Torgan" used in the *Speculum* in the account of the Works of Mercy (f. 115b). This is not present in the tract on the Pater Noster, but it is found in the *Somme* (British Museum Addit. ms. 28,162, f. 108b.—"Marie doingines"), though not in the *Miroir* as printed. It is in the *Mirror* (f. 84).

³⁷ *Romania*, xxvi, p. 109.

³⁸ See *Histoire littéraire*, xxvii, p. 183, *Romania*, xxiv, p. 82.

Anno Domini Millesimo ccc^{mo} lxxxiii^{jo}, compilatio ista hoc modo Cantabrigiae erat examinata; dum a quodam sacerdote ad ligandum ibidem fuit posita a quibusdam scholaribus, diligenter erat intuita, atque perfecta, et cancellario Universitatis ejusque concilio praesentata, propter defectus et haereses examinanda, ne minus litterati populum per eam negligenter fallant, et in varios errores fallaciter inducant. Tunc jussu cancellarii, coram eo et toto consilio universitatis, per quatuor dies, cum omni studio et diligentia fuit examinata, atque in omni collegio undique comprobata, die quinto, omnibus doctoribus utriusque juris et magistris theologiae, cum cancellario, dicentibus et affirmantibus eam de sacris legibus et libris divinis bene ac subtiliter tractatam, et ex auctoritate omnium doctorum sacrae paginae sapienter allegatam, id est affirmatam, necnon et fundatam. Ideo quicumque fueris, o lector, hanc noli contempnere, quia sine dubio si aliqui defectus in ea inventi fuissent, coram Universitate Cantabrigiae combusta fuisset.³⁹

Though no positive certainty can of course be attached to such information, unsupported by other evidence, there is nothing, on the other hand, to render it positively suspicious,⁴⁰ unless it be the fact that the manuscripts containing it all belong to the early fifteenth century, and by that time the suspicion with which vernacular religious works were regarded on account of Lollardry was so great that a note like the present one was practically useful as a safe-conduct,⁴¹ and therefore likely to be fabricated. Claims like the present one were sometimes made fraudu-

³⁹ Quoted from Bodl. MS. 446 as above by J. O. Halliwell, *Thornton Romances*, Camden Society, London, 1844, pp. xx f. The same note is found in Cambridge University MS. II. I. 36, and Caius College MS. 160.

⁴⁰ It was accepted as authentic by C. H. Cooper (*Annals of Cambridge*, Cambridge, 1842-1908, I, p. 128; v, p. 260. I am unable to trace the reference to the "Cambridge Portfolio"), and it is, on his authority, made the basis of a statement in *Old English Libraries*, by E. A. Savage ("The Antiquary's Books," London, 1911, p. 155).

⁴¹ Books written "in the time of John Wycliffe or since" were subject to examination, by the Constitutions of Archbishop Arundel in 1408 (see Wilkins, *Concilia Magnae Britanniae*, etc., London, 1737, III, pp. 314-9; see also pp. 338, 365, 378).

lently, merely for the sake of selling a book: for example, "Sir John Mandeville" says that he showed his work to the Pope at Rome, at a date when actually the Pope was at Avignon.⁴² Public examinations were, however, sometimes a fact, for Giraldus Cambrensis describes his own reading of his *Topography of Ireland* before the University of Oxford for three days,⁴³ and Rolandino of Padua read his Chronicle in 1262 before the University of Padua.⁴⁴ We may well believe that the conditions in the nation brought about by the rise of Lollardry were such as to make formal examinations of literary works especially likely in 1384, even though we have nothing of the kind testified to from other sources. This was the year of Wycliffe's death, when the Wycliffite movement had become definitely heretical, and its influence over the common people through preaching and literary propaganda (which had not yet been curbed) was probably at its height.⁴⁵ Under these circumstances it would seem very natural that the orthodox party in the church should authorise for laymen a safe and attractive manual of religious instruction, like the *Speculum*, and since Oxford was at the time a center of heresy, it may have fallen on Cambridge to initiate some of the propaganda of orthodoxy for the academic world. The part which Cambridge played in the Wycliffite controversy has not been investigated; one of the questions asked by Archbishop Arundel at his visitation of

⁴² *The voyage and travaile of Sir John Maundeville, Kt.*, ed. H. O. Halliwell, London, 1839, pp. 314-5. This analogy was kindly pointed out to me by Mr. G. G. Coulton.

⁴³ *De Rebus a se Gestis*, Bk. II, chap. 16, *Giraldi Cambrensis Opera*, ed. J. S. Brewer, London, 1861, Rolls Series, I, p. 72.

⁴⁴ See Coulton, *Mediæval Garner*, London, 1910, p. 268.

⁴⁵ Knyghton under the date, 1382, says that half the population was Wycliffite (*Chronicon*, Rolls Series, London, 1895, II, p. 185).

1401 was as to the presence of heretics, and it has been taken for granted that they were numerous, without any positive evidence being brought forward on the matter.⁴⁶ But, however this case may be, it is evident that Cambridge must have played a less important part in the Wycliffite movement than Oxford, the home of Wycliffe, and have been correspondingly more receptive of orthodox measures.

From early times the Church had attempted to define the *sine qua non* of a layman's proper religious knowledge, and the regulations seem to have become more exact after the fourth Council of the Lateran, in 1215, when special ordinances were made for the instruction of the clergy.⁴⁷ In England the basis of religious instruction for laymen during the later Middle Ages was the Constitutions of Archbishop Peckham of 1281,⁴⁸ though similar stipulations were made before this time;⁴⁹ and several compila-

⁴⁶ See Mullinger, *The University of Cambridge from the earliest times to the Royal Injunctions of 1535*, Cambridge, 1873, p. 258; see also p. 271.

⁴⁷ R. M. Woolley points out the large number of episcopal institutions put out in England after this time (*English Historical Review*, xxx, pp. 285 ff.).

⁴⁸ Wilkins, I, pp. 51-61; also Gasquet, *The Old English Bible and other Essays*, 2nd edit., London, 1908, p. 170. Four times a year, in the vernacular, the Articles of the Faith, Ten Commandments, Two Commandments, Seven Works of Mercy, Seven Deadly Sins, "and their progeny," Seven Virtues, and Seven Sacraments were to be preached. This statute is copied into many manuscripts, many of which are listed in Martin's edition of Peckham's *Letters* (Rolls Series, 1885, III, pp. cxxiii ff.).

⁴⁹ We find Roger de Weseham, "Bishop of Coventry and Lichfield, and principal favourite of Robert Grosseteste," composing a treatise for the use of his clergy which follows much the lines of the later works (see *Memoirs of the Life of Roger de Weseham*, by Samuel Pegge, London, 1761, p. 57). Grosseteste had laid down much the same in 1237 (see Cobb, *Alcuin Club Collections*, xviii, p. 53, n. 3). Stengel lists Anglo-Norman examples (*Digby MS.* 86, Halle, 1871, pp. 1 ff.)

tions for laymen distinctly mention the fact that they are composed to fulfill the requirements of Peckham's ordinance,⁵⁰ and many more,—of which, as will appear from extracts from the prologue printed below, the *Speculum* is one—tacitly fulfill the scheme of the ecclesiastical ordinances more or less closely. It is, in fact, to their relation to these decrees that the group of subjects treated in the *Speculum* and recurring in other treatises doubtless owe their wide and continued dissemination, and the practical usefulness which they served doubtless had its share in developing their arrangement into as compact and successfully didactic a compilation as possible. As we have seen, the *Speculum* went farther towards unifying the whole than its predecessors, and though it covered practically the whole range of subjects required for lay instruction according to Peckham's statutes, and more, yet it could be said to fulfill merely the single requirement also made, that the people should be taught the Lord's Prayer, an ordinance to which the tract on the Pater Noster, and the *Mirror* directly refer, as well as the *Speculum* (see *infra*, pp. 158-9).

With the rise of Lollardry the Constitutions of Archbishop Peckham took on still more importance, for by the Constitutions of Archbishop Arundel of 1408, already mentioned, vernacular preaching to laymen was rigidly limited to the subjects there laid down.⁵¹ It is possible—

⁵⁰ See the *Speculum Christiani*, one of the most popular works of the fifteenth century (of which, as it may be useful to note, the New York Public Library possesses a copy in an early printed edition), and the sermon of "Gaytring," compiled at the request of Archbishop Thoresby of York in 1359 (*EETS*, No. 118). It is altogether probable that other similar works were also inspired from above.

⁵¹ The Lollards put out treatises built on the traditional framework (see Arnold, *Select English Works of Wyclif*, Oxford, 1869-71, III), and (though the question is of course uncertain because of the uncertain date of the pieces) it may be that here, as in other cases, they were availing themselves of an orthodox ordinance as a cloak.

though on this subject we have no proof—that the practice of putting books, both Latin and English, into parish churches for “common use,” which is commonly recorded during the last century and a half before the Reformation, made also part of the “Counter-Reformation” which followed Lollardry.⁵² One of the most frequent of these books was the *Pupilla Oculi*, a Latin manual of popular religious instruction for the use of parish priests.⁵³ The authorship of this work is disputed, but it is generally ascribed to John de Burgh, who, it must be noted, was made Chancellor of the University of Cambridge in 1384, and would therefore be the Chancellor referred to by the note on the *Speculum*.⁵⁴ At the time, therefore, to which

⁵² See, for examples of such gifts, Savage, pp. 128 f. It may be noted that Queen Isabel of France ordered the *Somme* placed in a Paris church for the use of the people (Warton-Hazlitt, III, p. 103).

⁵³ Savage, p. 132. In the few examples which he chooses for quotation this book occurs four times.

⁵⁴ Miss Mary Bateson states of the *Pupilla*, without giving her authority, that it “may be by Grosseteste, Peter de Limoges, Johannes or Jo. de Burgo” (*op. cit.*, p. 191, n. 6). The four copies owned by Syon Monastery which she is describing are all anonymous, and this seems to be the case with most manuscripts of the work. Most writers on the subject accept the authorship of de Burgh, on the strength of the edition printed in 1510 in Paris for W. Hopyl, at the expense of Bretton (as was also the *Speculum Spiritualium*). The heading is quoted by Maskell as follows: “Pupilla oculi, omnibus presbyteris præcipue Anglicanis summe necessaria: per sapientissimum divini cultus moderatorem, Johannem de Burgo, quondam almae universitatis Cantabrigien. cancellarium: et sacræ paginæ professorem, necnon ecclesiæ de Colingam rectorem; compilata anno a natali Dominico, M.ccc.lxxxv. In qua tractatur de septem sacramentorum administratione, de decem præceptis decalogi, et de reliquis ecclesiasticorum officiis, quæ oportet sacerdotem rite institutum non ignorare” (*Monumenta Ritualia*, London, 1847, III, p. lxxix, n. 29). He notes another edition in 1514. The continued authority of this book appears also from the fact that it seems to have been used in the *Rationale* of 1540-3 (see edition by C. S. Cobb, already cited, p. 6, n. 1). Maskell notes that a “Pupilla” is referred to as early as

the note refers, not only was there a general situation existing in England in which the examination of an English manual of popular religious instruction, built on the frame-work furnished by Peckham, would be a suitable measure, and may have taken place as the beginning of the "Counter-Reformation" of which we have evidence at a later date, but the highest authority at Cambridge was apparently showing a special interest in the orthodox teaching of laymen. These facts do not, of course, prove the validity of the note, but they suggest that it is worth further investigation.

However far the *Speculum Vitae* may appear to us to-day from the type of work to which an academic sanction would be granted, there can be no doubt that it represented some of the best theology of its time, worked over, as it seems, by a compiler of some talent. The *Somme*,—which it is hard to appreciate in the barbarous Kentish dialect in which we have generally known it,—has received

1311 (*ibid.*); Gasquet notes a *Pars oculi* by William Pagula or Walter Parker, of the middle of the fourteenth century (*op. cit.* pp. 170-3), and Savage refers to "several books of this title" (p. 252). A *De Oculo Morali*, given to Grosseteste in many manuscripts, is described by Martin (*op. cit.*, pp. lxxxi f.), and a reference to the description of the same work given by Little (*op. cit.*, p. 151) makes it probable that it has been confused with the *Pupilla* by Miss Bateson. A treatise on Prayer, not hitherto noted, exists in MS. 1053, of Trinity College, Cambridge, with the title "*Pupilla oculi interioris hominis*." It shows the influence strongly of Richard Rolle.—The *Pupilla Oculi* is quoted from frequently by Rock (*Church of Our Fathers*, ed. Hart and Frere, London, 1905). It would seem to offer, for parish clergy, a very suitable equivalent to what the *Speculum* offers for the direct use of the laity. If de Burgh is not the author of the *Pupilla*, it is possible that an approbation of the work by him may have been the cause of his connection. The authenticity of the heading of Hopyl is to some extent substantiated by the fact that it is certain that de Burgh became Chancellor of Cambridge in 1384 (see Cooper, I, p. 128).

its just measure of praise from the best French scholars. Quétif and Échard thought that with some alterations of language it would be as popular today as ever;⁵⁵ M. Léopold Delisle recognises it as "the manual of religious morals which had the greatest vogue during the last three centuries of the Middle Ages";⁵⁶ and M. Ch. V. Langlois calls it "'the Imitation of Christ' of the thirteenth century,—of which several portions are certainly the masterpieces of mediæval edifying literature."⁵⁷ To the virtues which it shares with the *Somme*—or the *Miroir*—the *Speculum* has added from the tract on the Pater Noster,⁵⁸ or a common original, a superior structure, and from some source unknown—or the invention of its compiler—considerable realism of an amusing sort. To the modern student, in any case, whatever the circumstances of its origin or whoever its author, it has great interest in offering a complete mirror of the orthodox mediæval instruc-

⁵⁵ Quoted in the *Histoire* of Petit de Julleville, II, p. 182.

⁵⁶ *Recherches sur la librairie de Charles V*, Paris, 1907, p. 236. He is commenting on the set of illustrations which accompany the *Somme* in many copies, and are an interesting sign of its currency among the rich.

⁵⁷ *Loc. cit.*

⁵⁸ It seems likely that this is an English production, though of course nothing definite can be arrived at on the subject. The six volumes of the *Notices et extraits* of B. Hauréau (Paris, 1890-3), probably the richest treasury available of information on such matters, contain no reference to this work, and no manuscript has turned up during a fairly extended perusal of catalogues of manuscripts in French libraries. M. Paul Meyer says (*Bulletin*, 1896, p. 43, n.) that there are several expositions of the Pater Noster in French, "surtout" that of *La Somme*, and that at the beginning of the Sermons of Maurice de Sully (on which see *Romania*, XXIII, p. 499). The *Speculum* uses an English proverb ("for men sayn on old englis," f. 138), and refers to the King of England (f. 147). Such references, however, could easily be added in the translation, and do not necessarily mean anything as to the source.

tion for laymen.⁵⁹ By its attachment to the Pater Noster of the whole theology and ethics of the Church, as they concerned laymen, it is a triumph of the mediæval art of hanging a universal theology to the exposition of texts, and it would seem that its carefully articulated schematism⁶⁰ solved the general problem of what might be called the architechtonics of the *Summa* for laymen,—which was a form of literature for which the ecclesiastical statutes kept alive the demand, and to some extent fixed the elements.

The following parallel quotations will, it is hoped, illustrate the preceding statements.

The quotations from the *Speculum* are made from Ullmann's article, in which he uses ms. Ll. i. 8, supplemented by ms. Ii. i. 36, dated 1423 (one of the copies containing the note as to the examination).

The quotations from the *Mirror* are made from Harl. ms. 45, of the early fifteenth century, originally the book of "Dame Margaret Brent." Two other copies of the fifteenth century exist in the Bodleian library, viz.: E. Mus. 35, ff. 221-452^v, and Rawl. ms. A. 356, both imperfect at the beginning.

The quotations from the tract on the Pater Noster are made from Burney ms. 356, of the early fifteenth century,

⁵⁹ It is probably due to the superior quality of the elements out of which the *Speculum* is compounded, rather than to any superior talent in the compiler, that the *Speculum* is a work of distinctly better quality than the *Prick of Conscience*.

⁶⁰ The full intention operating in a work like the *Speculum*, with its—to us—over-elaborate connections, cannot be understood unless the mediæval characteristic is understood which is signalled by M. Langlois in the following: "C'a été l'une des manies du moyen âge de croire fermement à la valeur des machines intellectuelles et d'en confectionner beaucoup: machines mnémotechniques, machines à penser, machines à prier, machines à prêcher" (*L'éloquence sacrée*, p. 193).

(ff. 8 ff.), in which it makes part of a compilation entitled *Flos Florum*, referred to by Gasquet, as a "manual in twenty-five books, the first being on the Lord's Prayer."⁶¹ The only other reference to the work is one made in Horstmann's *Yorkshire Writers*,⁶² in which he notes the text in Harl. ms. 1022, and gives it to Richard Rolle for no visible reason. Other copies are Harl. ms. 1648, Addit. ms. 15, 237—both at the British Museum—and ms. Rawl. C. 72, ff. 137 ff.

The quotations from the *Miroir* are made from Chavannes' edition. All the passages here quoted occur also in the *Somme*, in the text found in Addit. ms. 28, 162, of the British Museum,—which is the manuscript of the work here used.

The openings of the *Speculum* and *Mirror* are as follows:

Speculum

"Almyzty god in trinite," . . .
—After the invocation, and an apology for the author's imperfections, he goes on:

"I warne þow first at þe begynnyng,

I wil make no veyn spekyng
Of dedes of armes ne of amours,
Os don mynstreles and oþer gestours,

þat make spekyng in many a place

Of Octouian and Isanbrace." . .

(Il. 35 f.)

—After a few similar lines and some account of the edifying

Mirror

"Fore hit is so þat all mankynde in this world nys but in exile and wildernesse out of his kyndely contre, or as is a pilgrym or a weyfaring man in a strang londe where he may in no manere abide. But nedely euery day, euery houre, and euery tyme is passynge on his way."

. . . . Our goal is one of two cities, Babylon or Jerusalem, which are in turn described and interpreted with quotations from the Meditations of St. Augustine. "And for man may not knowe in whiche of these two

⁶¹ *Op. cit.*, p. 175. He apparently neglects to observe that the notes in Harl. ms. 1648, to which he refers (p. 173), are the same work.

⁶² London, 1894, II, p. 157.

substitute which he offers, comes the following:

"In English tonge I schal 3ow telle,
 gif 3e wyth me so longe wil dwelle.

No Latyn wil I speke no waste,
 But English, þat men vse mast."

. . . (ll. 61 f.)

An interesting discussion of this subject follows; after which the *Speculum* joins the *Mirror*, as follows:

"And swyche a lessoun I schal 3ow 3eue,
 þat myrour of lyf to 3ow may be,
 In þe whiche 3e may al 3owre lyf se.

First I wyl speke of þe gret profit

Of þe Pater Noster, þat cometh of it,

And of þe fruyt and dignyte
 Of þat pray3er, os men may se,
 And specially of þe seuene askynges,

þat on þe Pater Noster henges,
 And of þe seuene 3yftes of þe holy gost,

þat þe seuene askynges may to vs haste,

And of þe seuene synnes, þat most may smerte,

þat þe seuene 3yftes putten out of herte,

And specially of þe vertues seuene,
 þat may be set in here stede euene,

And of þe seuene blessyd hedes,
 To whiche þe seuene vertuwes vs ledes,

And of þe seuene medes alle,
 þat of þe blessedhedys schulde falle; (ll. 92 f., pp. 468 f.)

weyes he goþ ynne ne whiderward he is, but he knowe what is vertu, and what is synne. Therefore þis writyng is thus made for lewed and menliche lettred men and wymmen in suche tonge as þei can best vnderstonde. And may be cleped a myrour to lewde men and wymmen, in whiche they may see god þorgh stedfast by leue, and hem self þorgh mekenes, and what is vertu, and what is synne.

. . . This writyng schal be gynne with þat holy prayer þat cristе him self made and taghte, þat is the Pater Noster, as the gospel berith witnesse. And first in this writyng shal be schewed þe profyte and fruigt and þe dignyte of the holy prayer, the Pater noster. Afterward þe seuene askynges þat ben in the Pater noster. And þe seuene 3yftes of þe holy goost þat we asketh þerby. And þe seuene hede synnes þat tho seuene 3yftes putten away. And þe seuene vertues þat the seuene 3yftes setten in the stede of þe seuene synnes. And þe seuene blissedhedes þat the seuene vertues bringeþ vs to. And also þe seuene medes þat bringeth to þe seuene blissedhedis." (f. 3 f.)

The *Somme* and the *Miroir*, as has already been stated, put the exposition of the Pater Noster towards the end of the whole. The *Miroir*, however, (p. 30) bears some relation to the English works in stating its title at the beginning, though in terms that bear them no special relation. The tract on the Pater Noster, as has already been noted, gives the arrangement found in the *Speculum* and *Mirror*. It is headed by the following summary: "Hic incipit compendiosus tractatus de utilitate orationis dominice, in quo breuiter tractatur de vii petitionibus eiusdem. . . . Item de vii donis spiritus sancti. . . . Item de vii peccatis mortalibus. . . . Item de vii virtutibus principalibus. . . . Item de vii beatitudinibus et eorum meritis" (f. 8).⁶³ Both the tract and the French treatises are used in the remainder of the introduction, as the following quotations will show:

Speculum

þe Pater Noster first men lerys,
For it is heued of alle prayeres.
It is a prayzer most suffysaunt
To alle þe þat it wyl hawunt,
And most syker, wher we go,
For þis lyf and þe toþer al so;
Where fore eche man, þat has
tane
Trewthe of baptesme at þe
fount stane,
þat prayere schulde lere and
entente

Mirror

Firste men scholen vndirstonde
þat þe Pater Noster is heed of
all prayers, and þe moste suffi-
sant and most siker for this lyf
and þat other. Wherefore eche
cristen man by comandement of
holy chirche schal lerne þis
prayer. And who so wol not
lerne hit he despiseth goddes
lawe. And þerfore it is the
firste thing of lettrure þat is
taght to children. This prayer

⁶³ The *Somme* and *Miroir* (p. 248) make a similar concatenation of subjects, but in the middle of the whole work. It should be noted that the present list by no means exhausts the subjects of the *Speculum*, for they include almost every category developed by mediæval schematicism. Some impression of its range may be gained by examination of its derivative, "The Desert of Religion" (Herrig's *Archiv*, cxxvii, pp. 388 f., where I point out the relation between the two works, and *ibid.*, cxxvi, pp. 58 ff., where the text is given).

Thorow holy chyrches comande-
ment;

And þei, þat wyl nowt lere nor
knowe

þat prayer, despysen goddes
lawe;

þere fore þe maner is to loke:

Whan a chyld is set to boke,

þe Pater Noster he schal first
lere,

For it is most preciouſe prayere;

þat lessoun good almyghty

Tawte hys deſſiples ſpecially;

þere fore may it be ryht calde

Godes prayere, os we it halde,

Where fore, þat vnderſtonden
wyle

þis leſſoun, os þei ſchulde be
ſkyle,

þei ſchulde become boþe meke
and myld

And debonere, os ony chylde.

Swyche ben þe verray ſcoleres
ryȝt

Of oure wys maister, god al-
myght,

þat, os hys wysdom ofte hem
leres

And techeth hem os hys owne
ſcoleres.

But we may fynde many a man,
þat þe naked lettre can

Of þis prayere, þat Cryſt wrowt,
But þe vnderſtondeng can þei

nowt;

þere fore hem thynketh, it
ſauowreth þe leſſe,

For þere Inne fele þei no ſwet-
neſſe;

For lytel deuociown hauen þei
In þe Pater Noster, whan þei it

ſey.

But who ſo vnderſtonde it wylle,
A ſwete prayere may þei fele.

(ll. 113 ff.)

taghte oure lord ihesu crist to
his diſciples and þerefore it is
cleped goddes prayer. And who
ſo wil vnderſtonde þis prayer,
he ſcholde be meke and mylde
and debonaire; ffor ſuch beþ the
verray ſcolers of oure lord god.
Many man conne þe naked lettre
of this prayer, but noght þe
vnderſtondyng, and þerefore it is
to hem ſauorles. Wherefore þey
ſeyn hit with litel deuocion or
none. And ſo it is to hem litel
or no profite. But who ſo vnder-
ſtondith it wel, he ſchal fynde
þerynne moche ſwetneſſe and
perfitte deuocion. (f.3b.)

Pater Noster

Pater Noster tanquam caput omnium orationum euidenter approbatur. Quia ex sui virtute quantum ad omnia nobis necessaria pro vita presenti et futura petenda sufficere videtur. Quam quidem orationem vnusquisque christianus tam ex precepto quam ex consilio ecclesie scire et intelligere tenetur. Nam qui illam orationum scire negligit, doctrinam dei manifeste contempnit. Iecirco paruulus quum de nouo ad librum apponitur, primo adiscit Pater noster. Nam istam leccionem dominus noster ihesus christus docuit discipulos suos. Ideo merito dicitur oratio dominica.

Vnde qui istam doctrinam scire et intelligere voluerunt, erunt humiles vt paruuli. Tales enim sunt veri scolares sapientissimi domini nostri ihesu christi quos de sui doctrina instruit et informat. Multi tamen mundani litteram istius orationis sciunt et intelligunt, sed eius sententiam totaliter nesciunt. Illi vero in ea modicum senciunt saporem et qui nullam deuocionis dulcedinem sed qui bene et recte intelligunt orationem predictam ipsam ut mel in ore senciunt dulcissimam.

(f. 8)

Miroir

Quant on met un enfant a l'escole, au commencement on li aprent sa Patrenostre. Qui de ceste clergie veut aprendre, deviègne humble comme enfant. Quer à tiex escoliers aprent nostre bon maistre Ihucrist ceste clergie, qui est la plus bèle et la plus pourfitable, quant on l'entent, et la retient. Quer tel le cuide bien savoir et entendre, qui onques rien sot fors l'escorce, par dehors.

C'est la leitre qui bonne est; mais poc vaut au regart du noyel qui est par dedans si doux.

(p. 250)

In conclusion, some account will be given of the treatment in the two English works of the "Ninth Branch of Avarice," along with the very meagre references to the same subject in the *Pater Noster* and the *Miroir*. As may be guessed from the outline given below, this material,

which will be seen to be for the most part lacking in the available sources, makes one of the very best portions of the English poem and treatise,—in fact, it may be said to be one of the most entertaining descriptions of the familiar life of the time to be found in a Middle English theological work.⁶⁴ It should be noted, however, that an apparent abridgment of their treatment of Avarice is one of the grounds for postulating a larger *Summa* behind the French treatises.⁶⁵ This ultimate source may therefore have been responsible for the fuller descriptions found in the English derivatives.

The English works treat the subject at length under the following heads:

- (1) common women.
- (2) jugglers.
- (3) "faitours."
- (4) "snecke-drawers," (in the *Mirror*, "drawlacches"), or "robertsmen."⁶⁶
- (5) harlots.
- (6) heralds.
- (7) champions.
- (8) "tollers."
- (9) hangmen. (*Speculum*, f. 100, *Mirror*, f. 71b.)

⁶⁴ Part of this section of the poem was printed by Dr. Furnivall, *Notes and Queries*, 4th Series, III, pp. 169, 189.

⁶⁵ Fowler, p. 33.

⁶⁶ Warton quotes a statute of Edward III (*an. reg.* 5) confirmed by Richard II (*an. reg.* 7) against "roberdesmen" and "drawlacches" (II, p. 271, n. 3).

Pater Noster.

Malum artificium,
quo utuntur mere-
trices, ribaldi, his-
triones, theolena-
rii, ioculatores, et
huiusmodi.

(f. 16.)

Miroir.

A la deerraine
(tenth) branche de
convoitise apartien-
nent tous les mau-
vais mestiers que on
aprent et maintient,
pour gaaagner. Si
comme de ces faus
courretiers qui ne fi-
nent de gent engigi-
ner, et de ces cham-
pions qui s'entretuent
pour deniers, et ces
faus monoiers et de
ceus qui font les dés
et les chapiaus de
fleurs. (p. 151)

Somme.

La nouieme branche
dauarice est mauvaiz
mestier. En ce pe-
chent mult de genz
et en mout de mani-
eres; comme font ce
fols femes qui pour vn
pou de gaaing saban-
donent a pechie. Ausi
comme cil heraut et
cil champion et mout
dautres qui pour de-
niers ou por preu
temporel sabandon-
nent a mestier des-
honeste qui ne peut
estre faiz sanz pechie.
(Brit. Mus. Addit.

ms. 28, 162, f. 30)^a

HOPE EMILY ALLEN.

^a It may be noted that the unidentified French treatise found in a Christ Church fragment by F. Y. Powell (*Modern Language Quarterly*, II, p. 21 f.) is the *Somme* or *Miroir*.—A word should be said in reference to the puzzling copy of the *Speculum* in Addit. ms. 22, 283 of the British Museum containing a couplet at the end giving the title "Prikke of Conscience," which was quoted in my former article (pp. 168-9). An examination of this manuscript and the Vernon ms. of the Bodleian, which seems to be its prototype, shows the source of the lines in question. In the Vernon ms. the couplet headed the *Prick of Conscience*, which there directly followed the *Speculum*. The scribe of the copy inserted a new piece between the two poems, and attached the rhymed title to the earlier, though it belonged to the later.